

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

HILTON KARRIEM MINCY, )  
Plaintiff, ) Case No. 1:09-cv-236  
v. )  
SECURITY LIEUTENANT )  
WILLIAM P. McCONNELL, *et al*, )  
Defendants. )

## ORDER

Presently pending before the Court in the above-captioned case is a motion by the Plaintiff, Hilton Karriem Mincy, for reconsideration of the Memorandum Order entered on April 25, 2012 [106]. To prevail on a motion for reconsideration, the movant must establish: “(1) an intervening change in the controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence ...; or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or fact or to prevent manifest injustice.” *Brodzki v. Fox Broadcasting*, 464 Fed. Appx. 43, 44 (3d Cir. 2012) (quoting *Max’s Seafood Café ex rel. Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros*, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir.1999)). Because my review of Plaintiff’s motion reveals no basis under the foregoing standard justifying reconsideration of my April 25 Memorandum Order, the Plaintiff’s motion [111] shall be, and hereby is, DENIED.

s/ Sean J. McLaughlin

SEAN J. McLAUGHLIN  
United States District Judge

cm: All parties of record.